arXiv:1404.3469v1 [math.CO] 14 Apr 2014

Polynomial reconstruction of the matching polynomial*

Xueliang Li, Yongtang Shi, Martin Trinks
Center for Combinatorics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China
lxl@nankai.edu.cn, shi@nankai.edu.cn,
martin.trinks@googlemail.com

Abstract

The matching polynomial of a graph is the generating function of the numbers of its matchings with respect to their cardinality. A graph polynomial is polynomial reconstructible, if its value for a graph can be determined from its values for the vertex-deleted subgraphs of the same graph. This note discusses the polynomial reconstructibility of the matching polynomial. We collect previous results, prove it for graphs with pendant edges and disprove it for some graphs.

1 Introduction

The famous (and still unsolved) reconstruction conjecture of Kelly [8] and Ulam [14] states that every graph G with at least three vertices can be reconstructed from (the isomorphism classes of) its vertex-deleted subgraphs.

With respect to a graph polynomial $P(G)$, this question may be adapted as follows: Can $P(G)$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ be reconstructed from the graph polynomials of the vertex deleted-subgraphs, that is from the collection $P(G_{-v})$ for $v \in V$? Here, this problem is considered for the matching polynomial of a graph, which is the generating function of the number of its matchings with respect to their cardinality.

This paper aims to prove that graphs with pendant edges are polynomial reconstructible and, on the other hand, to display some evidence that arbitrary graphs are not.

In the reminder of this section the necessary definitions and notation are given. Further, the previous results from the literature are mentioned in Section 2. Section 3 and Section 4 contain the result for pendant edges and the counterexamples in the general case.

*This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A *matching* in G is an edge subset $A \subseteq E$, such that no two edges have a common vertex. The *matching polynomial* $M(G, x, y)$ is defined as

$$M(G, x, y) = \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq E \\ A \text{ is matching in } G}} x^{\mathrm{def}(G,A)} y^{|A|}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathrm{def}(G, A) = |V| - |\bigcup_{e \in A} e|$ is the number of vertices not included in any of the edges of A. A matching A is a *perfect matching*, if its edges include all vertices, that means if $\mathrm{def}(G, A) = 0$. A *near-perfect matching* A is a matching that includes all vertices except one, that means $\mathrm{def}(G, A) = 1$. For more information about matchings and the matching polynomial, see [2; 6; 10].

There are also two versions of univariate matching polynomials defined in the literature, namely the *matching defect polynomial* and the *matching generating polynomial* [10, Section 8.5]. For simple graphs, the previously mentioned matching polynomials are equivalent to each other.

For a graph $G = (V, E)$ with a vertex $v \in V$, G_{-v} is the graph arising from the *deletion* of v, i.e. arising by the removal of all edges incident to v and v itself. The multiset of (the isomorphism classes of) the vertex-deleted subgraphs G_{-v} for $v \in V$ is the *deck* of G. The *polynomial deck* $\mathcal{D}_P(G)$ with respect to a graph polynomial $P(G)$ is the multiset of $P(G_{-v})$ for $v \in V$. A graph polynomial $P(G)$ is *polynomial reconstructible*, if $P(G)$ can be determined from $\mathcal{D}_P(G)$.

2 Previous results

For results about the polynomial reconstruction of other graph polynomials, see the article by Brešar, Imrich, and Klavžar [1, Section 1] and the references therein. For additional results, see [9; 11, Section 7; 12, Subsection 4.7.3].

By arguments analogous to those used in Kelly's Lemma [8], the derivative of the matching polynomials of a graph $G = (V, E)$ equals the sum of the polynomials in the corresponding polynomial deck.

Proposition 1 (Lemma 1 in [3])**.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. The matching polynomial $M(G, x, y)$ satisfies*

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta x} M(G, x, y) = \sum_{v \in V} M(G_{-v}, x, y). \tag{2}$$

In other words, all coefficients of the matching polynomial except the one corresponding to the number of perfect matchings can be determined from the polynomial deck and thus also from the deck:

$$m_{i,j}(G) = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{v \in V} m_{i,j}(G_{-v}) \qquad \forall i \leq 1, \tag{3}$$

where $m_{i,j}(G)$ is the coefficient of the monomial $x^i y^j$ in $M(G, x, y)$.

Consequently, the (polynomial) reconstruction of the matching polynomial reduces to the determination of the number of perfect matchings.

Proposition 2. *The matching polynomial $M(G, x, y)$ of a graph G can be determined from its polynamial deck $\mathcal{D}_M(G)$ and its number of perfect matchings. In particular, the matching polynomials $M(G, x, y)$ of graphs with an odd number of vertices are polynomial reconstructible.*

Tutte [13, Statement 6.9] has shown that the number of perfect matchings of a simple graph can be determined from its deck and therefore gave an affirmative answer on the reconstruction problem for the matching polynomial.

The matching polynomial of a simple can graph also be reconstructed from the deck of edge-extracted and edge-deleted subgraphs [3, Theorem 4 and 6] and from the polynomial deck of the edge-extracted graphs [7, Corollary 2.3]. For a simple graph G on n vertices, the matching polynomial is reconstructible from the collection of induced subgraphs of G with $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1$ vertices [5, Theorem 4.1].

3 Result for simple graphs with pendant edges

Theorem 3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a forest. G has a perfect matching if and only if each vertex-deleted subgraph G_{-v} for $v \in V$ has a near-perfect matching.*

Proof. For the first direction we assume that G has a perfect matching M. Then each vertex-deleted subgraph G_{-v} has a near-perfect matching $M' = M \setminus e$, where e is the edge in the matching M incident to v.

For the second direction, let w be one of the vertices of degree 1 and u its neighbor. If each vertex-deleted subgraph has a near-perfect matching, say M', so does G_{-u}. Hence, $M' \cup \{\{u, w\}\}$ is a perfect matching of G. □

Actually, this theorem can be generalized to simple graphs with a pendant edge (or equivalently a vertex of degree 1).

Theorem 4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph with a vertex of degree 1. G has a perfect matching if and only if each vertex-deleted subgraph G_{-v} for $v \in V$ has a near-perfect matching.*

The proof is exactly the same as for the theorem above. We do not know whether or not this can be further generalized to arbitrary simple connected graphs and are also not aware of publications regarding this questions. Therefore, this problem seems to be worth further studies.

Forests have either none or one perfect matching. Because every pendant edge must be in a perfect matching (in order to cover the vertices of degree 1) and the same holds recursively for the subforest arising by deleting all the vertices of the pendant edges. Therefore, from Proposition 2 and Theorem 3 the polynomial reconstructibility of the matching polynomials follows.

Corollary 5. *The matching polynomials $M(G, x, y)$ of forests are polynomial reconstructible.*

On the other hand, arbitrary graphs with pendant edges can have more than one perfect matching. However, Theorem 3 can be extended to obtain the number of perfect matchings. For a graph $G = (V, E)$, the number of perfect matchings and of near-perfect machtings of G is denoted by $\mathrm{p}(G)$ and $\mathrm{np}(G)$, respectively.

Theorem 6. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph with a pendant edge $e = \{u, w\}$ where w is a vertex of degree 1. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{p}(G) = \mathrm{np}(G_{-u}) \leq \mathrm{np}(G_{-v}) \qquad \forall v \in V \text{ and particularly} \tag{4}$$

$$\mathrm{p}(G) = \min\{\mathrm{np}(G_{-v}) \mid v \in V\}. \tag{5}$$

Proof. For each vertex $v \in V$, each perfect matching of G corresponds to a near-perfect matching of G_{-v} (by removing the edge including v). But the converse is not necessarily true, namely there are near-perfect matching of G_{-v} leaving a non-neighbor of v in G unmatched. Thus, we have $\mathrm{p}(G) \leq \mathrm{np}(G_{-v})$.

In case of the vertex u, each near-perfect matching M' of G_{-u} corresponds to a perfect matching M of G, namely $M' \cup \{e\}$, and vice versa. Thus, we have $\mathrm{p}(G) = \mathrm{np}(G_{-u})$, giving the result. □

By applying this theorem, the number of perfect matchings of a simple graph with pendant edges can be determined from its polynomial deck and the following result is obtained as a corollary.

Corollary 7. *The matching polynomials $M(G, x, y)$ of simple graphs with a pendant edge are polynomial reconstructible.*

4 Counterexamples for arbitrary graphs

While it is true that the matching polynomials of graphs with an odd number of vertices or with an pendant edge are polynomial reconstructible, it does not hold for arbitrary graphs.

There are graphs which have the same polynomial deck and yet their matching polynomials are different. Although there are already counterexamples with as little as six vertices, its seems that nothing have been published before in connection with the question addressed here.

Remark 8. The matching polynomials $M(G, x, y)$ of arbitrary graphs are not polynomial reconstructible. The minimal counterexample for simple graphs (with respect to the number of vertices and edges) are the graphs G_1, G_2 shown in Figure 1.

The graphs creating the minimal counterexample have six vertices and there are three more pairs of such simple graphs, which are given in Figure 2.

G_1 G_2

$$M(G_1, x, y) = 2y^3 + \cdots \neq 0y^3 + \cdots = M(G_2, x, y)$$

G'_1 G'_2

$$M(G'_1, x, y) = 3xy^2 + 4x^3y + x^5 = M(G'_2, x, y)$$

Figure 1: Graphs G_1 and G_2, which are the minimal simple graphs creating a counterexamples for the polynomial reconstructibility of the matching polynomial $M(G, x, y)$. The decks of G_1 and G_2 consist of six graphs, each isomorphic to G'_1 and G'_2, respectively. Unlike the matchin polynomials of G_1 and G_2, the matching polynomials of G'_1 and G'_2 coincide.



G_3 G_4

$G_5 = \overline{G_4}$ $G_6 = \overline{G_3}$

$G_7 = \overline{G_2}$ $G_8 = \overline{G_1}$

Figure 2: The other counterexamples on six vertices for the polynomial reconstructibility of the matching polynomial $M(G, x, y)$.

The question arises, whether or not there are such counterexamples consisting of graphs with an arbitrary even number of vertices. In the reminder, we give an affirmative answer to this questions.

Let P_n and C_n be a *path* and a *cycle* on n vertices, respectively. For a graph $G = (V, E)$, $\overline{G}$ denotes the *complement* of G, i.e. $\overline{G} = (V, \binom{V}{2} \setminus E)$. For two graphs G and H, the *disjoint union* of G and H is denoted by $G \cup H$.

Theorem 9. *Let $k \leq 3$. The matching polynomials $M(G, x, y)$ of the graphs C_{2k}, $C_k \cup C_k$ and $\overline{C_{2k}}$, $\overline{C_k \cup C_k}$ are not polynomial reconstructible.*

Proof. Due to Godsil [4, Corollary 2.3], the matching polynomial of a graph is determined by the matching polynomial of the complement of this graph. Furthermore, $\overline{G_{-v}} = \overline{G}_{-v}$. Therefore, it is enough to consider the graphs C_{2k} and $C_k \cup C_k$.

The matching polynomials of these two graphs do not coincide because C_{2k} has exactly two perfect matchings, while $C_k \cup C_k$ has zero (k odd) or four (k even) perfect matchings.

On the other hand, their polynomial decks are identical. At first observe, that $(C_{2k})_{-v}$ is isomorphic to P_{2k-1} and $(C_k \cup C_k)_{-v}$ is isomorphic to $C_k \cup P_{k-1}$ for every vertex v of the respective graph.

It remains to show that the matching polynomials of these graphs in the deck coincide, i.e. $M(P_{2k-1}, x, y) = M(C_k \cup P_{k-1}, x, y)$. Therefore, we make use of the well-known recurrence relation for the matching polynomial [2, Theorem 1]:

$$M(G, x, y) = M(G_{-e}, x, y) + y \cdot M(G_{-u-v}, x, y),$$

where $e = \{u, v\}$ is an edge of G, G_{-e} is the graph with the edge e deleted and G_{-u-v} is the graph with the vertices of e deleted.

Applying the recurrence relation to the edge connecting the $(k-2)$th and $(k-1)$th vertex of P_{2k-1} (counted from either side), we obtain

$$M(P_{2k-1}, x, y) = M(P_{k-1} \cup P_k, x, y) + y \cdot M(P_{k-2} \cup P_{k-1}, x, y).$$

Applying the recurrence relation to an edge of the cycle in $C_k \cup P_{k-1}$, we obtain exactly the same term:

$$M(C_k \cup P_{k-1}, x, y) = M(P_k \cup P_{k-1}, x, y) + y \cdot M(P_{k-2} \cup P_{k-1}, x, y).$$

It follows, that the polynomial decks coincide, while the matching polynomials of the original graphs do not. Hence, those cannot be determined from the corresponding polynomial decks. □

In fact, the above construction for $k = 2$, in the case of the graphs C_4 and $C_2 \cup C_2$, where C_2 is a graph on two vertices connected by two parallel edges, provide an even smaller counterexample, though the graphs are not simple.

In addition, to obtain examples on an arbitrary even number of vertices such that the graphs and their complements are connected, the construction of the graphs G_3 and G_4 as well as of their complements G_5 and G_6 can be generalized analogously.

Acknowledgement

Many thanks are due to Julian A. Allagan for his suggestions improving the presentation of this paper.

References

[1] Boštjan Brešar, Wilfried Imrich, and Sandi Klavžar. "Reconstructing subgraph-counting graph polynomials of increasing families of graphs". In: *Discrete Mathematics* 297.1-3 (2005), pp. 159–166. DOI: 10.1016/j.disc.2005.02.019.

[2] Edward J. Farrell. "An Introduction to Matching Polynomials". In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 27.1 (1979), pp. 75–86. DOI: 10.1016/0095-8956(79)90070-4.

[3] Edward J. Farrell and S. A. Wahid. "On the reconstraction of the matching polynomial and the reconstruction conjecture". In: *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences* 10.1 (1987), pp. 155–162. DOI: 10.1155/S016117128700019X.

[4] Chris D. Godsil. "Hermite polynomials and a duality relation for matchings polynomials". English. In: *Combinatorica* 1.3 (1981), pp. 257–262. DOI: 10.1007/BF02579331.

[5] Chris D. Godsil. "Matchings and Walks in Graphs". In: *Journal of Graph Theory* 5.3 (1981), pp. 285–297. DOI: 10.1002/jgt.3190050310.

[6] Ivan Gutman. "The acyclic polynomial of a graph". In: *Publications de l'Institut Mathématique* 22.36 (1977), pp. 63–69.

[7] Ivan Gutman. "Some analytical properties of the independence and matching polynomials". In: *Match* 1.28 (1992), pp. 139–150. URL: http://match.pmf.kg.ac.rs/electronic_versions/Match28/match28_139-150.pdf.

[8] Paul J. Kelly. "A congruence theorem for trees". In: *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 7.1 (1957), pp. 961–968. URL: http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.pjm/1103043674.

[9] Xueliang Li and Ivan Gutman. "A unified approach to the first derivatives of graph polynomials". In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 58.3 (1995), pp. 293–297. DOI: 10.1016/0166-218X(95)00121-7.

[10] László Lovász and M. D. Plummer. *Matching Theory*. Vol. 121. North-Holland Mathematics Studies. North-Holland, 1986. Google Books: mycZP-J344wC.

[11] Peter Tittmann, Ilia Averbouch, and Johann A. Makowsky. "The enumeration of vertex induced subgraphs with respect to the number of components". In: *European Journal of Combinatorics* 32.7 (2011), pp. 954–974. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejc.2011.03.017.

[12] Martin Trinks. "Graph Polynomials and Their Representations". PhD thesis. 2012. URL: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:105-qucosa-94991.

[13] William Thomas Tutte. "All the King's Horses (A Guide to Reconstruction)". In: *Graph theory and related topics*. Ed. by J. Adrian Bondy and U. S. R. Murty. Proceedings of the conference held in honour of Professor W. T. Tutte on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, University of Waterloo, July 5-9, 1977. Academic Press, 1979, pp. 15–33.

[14] S. M. Ulam. *A collection of mathematical problems*. Interscience Tracts in pure and applied mathematics 8. Interscience New York, 1960.